

**REMARKS**

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action dated May 28, 2004. Claims 1-27 were pending in the application. In the Office Action, claims 17-27 were rejected, and claims 1-16 were subject to restriction. In this Amendment, claims 17 and 25-27 have been amended. Claims 17-27 thus remain for consideration.

Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in light of the following remarks.

**§112 Rejections**

Claims 17-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Applicants have amended claims 17 and 25-27 and submit that the amendments to claims 17 and 25-27 render claims 17-27 compliant with §112. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejections under §112 be withdrawn.

**§103 Rejections**

Claims 17-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,181,711) in view of Krasinski et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,370).

Applicants submit that independent claims 17 and 25-27 are patentable over Zhang and Krasinski.

Applicants' invention as recited in the independent claims is directed toward converting content into a predetermined format. The claims specify that the content and a content-

information signal are received into a memory from a contents server, and that “said content and said content-information signal [are] recorded in said contents server in advance of reception by said [memory].” Supporting disclosure for Applicants’ feature of recording content and content-information signal in a contents server in advance of reception by a memory external to the contents server can be found in the specification at, for example, page 29, line 24 – page 30, line 8.

Neither Zhang nor Krasinski discloses recording content and content-information signal in a contents server in advance of reception by a memory external to the contents server. Accordingly, Applicants believe that claims 17 and 25-27 are patentable over Zhang and Krasinski – taken either alone or in combination – on at least this basis.

Claims 18-24 depend on claim 17. Since claim 17 is believed to be patentable over the cited reference, claims 18-24 are believed to be patentable over the cited references on the basis of their dependency on claim 17.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

Statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited references represent the present opinions of the Applicants' undersigned attorney and, in the event that the Examiner disagrees with any such opinions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the respective reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions, he/she is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

The Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

The Examiner's consideration of this matter is gratefully acknowledged.

Respectfully submitted,



Bruno Polito  
Registration No. 38,580  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants  
(212) 588-0800